

APPROVED MINUTES

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the Regular Meeting of August 10, 2009

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley Secretary: Christine Lewis

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall, 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance
With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members for Review: September 11, 2009

Approved: September 14, 2009

1. Call to Order, Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance:											07:01 PM			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ANDERSON	SIMPSON	HOFLEER	VICK	BRITTSCH	ROBERTSON	QUINLEY	MONTROSS	LEWIS	HERIGSTAD	SMITH	WEAVER	RUDOLF	VANKOUGHNETT	BACHMAN
P	P	P	A	A	P	A	P	P	P	A	P	P	A	P

Appendices to these Minutes: Appendices A & B Incorporated into body of Minutes

Total Number of Pages Comprising this Report: Thirty-one (31)

Note:

In the absence of Chair, Oliver Smith and Vice-Chair, Ann Quinley, this meeting is chaired by member, **Dr. Debra Hofler**.

Pledge of Allegiance: Richard Rudolf

Quorum Established: 10

Yes (X) No ()

2.	Approval of Minutes:				
	<p>Motion:</p> <p>"The VCCPG approves the minutes of July 13, 2009 as disseminated"</p> <table> <tr> <td>Maker/Second:</td><td>Voice Vote: (Y-N-A) 10-0-0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Rudolf/Montross</td><td>Motion Carries</td></tr> </table>	Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A) 10-0-0	Rudolf/Montross	Motion Carries
Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A) 10-0-0				
Rudolf/Montross	Motion Carries				

Notes:

3. Open Forum:
No speakers

4. Discussion Items (No VCCPG advisory is to be taken for the following items)

Chair Hofler – Before we proceed to item 4a) I want to make this announcement to all of our captive audience including the 100 or so of you that are here tonight to speak about item 4a) – the proposed EDCO green recycling plant on Betsworth Road.
There will be an additional meeting of the VCCPG on Monday, August 24th at 7PM here at the Community Center to finalize and approve our input & comments on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of the General Plan Update which has a deadline for comment of August 31st. This report will help to direct the future of Valley Center and it is very important if you want your voices heard that you attend.
In addition, Devon Muto of the DPLU will give us an update on the Plan Amendment Application (PAA) that the Accretive Group intends to file. Accretive wants to develop a western village and we will be discussing the potential impact of that project.

a) EDCO President Steve South discusses the EDCO green waste recycling facility proposed for 12363 Betsworth Road with the Planning Group and the public (30 minutes total allotted)

Chair Hofler – I need to make clear that this presentation on the proposed EDCO green waste facility is educational only. EDCO has made no formal application or submitted any plans to the

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2009

San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

APPROVED MINUTES

County and so this group can not comment on anything presented here this evening. The PG will not be discussing or voting on the EDCO matter until such time as there is an actual filing and a lengthy approval process begins. There is 30 minutes allotted for this presentation including 15 minutes by Steve South and then 15 minutes by members of the public. I see that the "opposition" to EDCO has requested permission for 4 speakers. Each speaker will have 3 minutes.

Steve South, President EDCO - Outlined the type and scope of the daily operation of proposed recycling facility noting that among the many benefits of the center, it would reduce landfills and create compost that would make soils healthier and return carbons to the soil. It is appropriate for Valley Center since this is an agricultural use on an agricultural site. The proposal is based on maximum operating conditions which means a maximum 20 transfer trucks per day and maximum of up to 25 sub-haulers & users per day and this will be regulated and spread out in time. He emphasized that the newest technologies would be used to control the disposal process including computerized monitoring of a covered aerated scattered pile system - special techniques to control odor, noise and dust.

The Dep't of Environmental Health requires that EDCO comply with all quarantine restrictions. No change in zoning is required but a Major Use Permit (MUP) will be. The CEQA review will include many items such as a facility permit from the State along with local enforcement by the Dep't of Environmental Health which will conduct monthly inspections at random.

EDCO appreciates this opportunity from the VCPG to have a dialogue and the community for its input. They are considering options as to how to use the balance of the site to benefit the community.

Bob Payne, Soldier Oaks Lane - Is a fan of recycling but not of recycling here. This facility is not in keeping with Valley Center "Country Living". He has concerns about the odor, noise and water use. The benefits to EDCO are obvious but it is a "real stretch" to see how it will benefit VC. This is not just about Betsworth Road, it is about all of Valley Center.

Bob Polito, Polito Family Farms, 11920 Betsworth - Has been a resident for over 35 years and a grower. In talking with the SD Farm Bureau, the major concern with green recycling is the transient waste transported into the community which could contain the Med fruit fly and the Asian citrus psyllid. Pests typically come into our region from casual urban garden waste. With our fruit and flower crops this is the last place that should be needlessly exposed to pests and quarantines. "I can not and will not go through another quarantine".

Larry Glavinic, PO Box 2088 - I question why this recycling plant is being placed 14 miles from 1-15 and on a dead-end road. These are not small trucks and Betsworth is not a major use road. There will be damage. It is a huge public safety issue should an accident occur.

Lynn Colt, Hidden Meadows - We are also concerned about accidents and fire because of the methane gas production.

Mel Schuler, 12662 Betsworth Rd - EDCO is not being "transparent" and we should not be fooled by their willingness to talk and "be open". Asks that the VCCPG be "vigilant" in future dealings on this project.

Karen Payne, Soldier Oaks Lane - Has a question for EDCO's president, "Where were you in asking for the public's input when you were considering buying the land to begin this project? That was the time to ask for our input if you were really concerned"

Bruce Heye - Wants to know how EDCO is going to regulate the flow of private vehicles that come in from Temecula or wherever. They can not tell them to come back at another time?

Mel Schuler - We want a commitment from EDCO tonight that they will file for a Major Use Permit and not some less restrictive type of permitting.

Steve South, EDCO - Yes, we will file for a Major Use Permit.

APPROVED MINUTES

b)	<p>P08-036 MUP; Serenity Oaks Ranch, 14044 Horse Creek Trail, notice of withdrawal of application by Rena Patnode for an Outdoor Events Facility.</p> <p>Hofler – There is no action required here. This is information to the PG on the status of a project that was brought before us and twice rejected.</p> <p>Rudolf – I understand that they continue to operate events. This has now become a code enforcement issue.</p> <p>Herigstad – If code enforcement is not pursuing violations, it may be necessary to contact the EPA to inspect the situation because there are environmental impact issues here since a creek runs through the property and they tend to be more aggressive in pursuit of violations.</p>
c)	<p>Sept 12, 2009 – Training on the Brown Act, how to process projects and topics related to our public group. Please submit your requests for items to be covered to Oliver Smith. Session will run from 10:00 am to 12:00 noon, location TBA.</p>
d)	<p>VCCPG nominated seat on the I-15 Corridor Design Review Board term expired in May, 2009. Barbara Rohrer has served one term in this position.</p> <p>Hofler – Chair authorizes the Nominations Subcommittee chair, Susan Simpson, to initiate the nominations process.</p> <p>Simpson – Will begin the process.</p>
5	Action Items (VCCPG advisory vote may be taken on the following items)
a)	<p>ZAP07-006; APN 132-320-46; Price Animal Company. Request for a Minor Use Permit has been withdrawn., Peter Price: Reptile Breeding facility on the north side of McNally Road between Cole Grade Rd and Nicole's Vista. Discussion of proponent's letter to DPLU and possible vote on a formal response.</p> <p>Discussion & Comments:</p> <p>Hofler - This was originally a nice project. There seems to be a disconnect between how small projects and large projects are dealt with by County planners. The letter from DPLU planner Peter Price demonstrates a lack of fairness and it would be helpful to understand how that happens.</p> <p>Rudolf – This was a project that was not brought before our Planning Group. It may be an appropriate case to examine with Brian Baca on September 12th.</p>
b)	<p>GP Update Committee – Review and discussion of report and motions presented on the Draft EIR, Draft General Plan and Draft Community Plan in preparation for additional regular VCCPG meeting scheduled for August 24th for advisory voting (Rich Rudolf, Chair)</p> <p>Rudolf – The GPU Subcommittee has been reviewing the adequacy of the Draft EIR and will bring its Recommended Comments for VCCPG approval to the August 24th meeting. The subcommittee will be meeting on August 13 and August 20 at 6PM at the VC library.</p>
c)	<p>Mobility/Circulation Subcommittee - Review and discussion of report and/or motions regarding Valley Center Road through the Southern Village, Draft EIR, Draft General Plan, and Draft Community Plan implications (Deb Hofler, Chair)</p> <p>Discussion & Comments:</p> <p>Hofler – We have had additional meetings and gone through the EIR. Our next meeting is this Wednesday, August 12th at 6:15 pm. We will make our final recommendations and changes to specific road standards. Our recommendations will then go to the GP Update Subcommittee who will incorporate them into their remarks and present them to the PG at our additional meeting on August 24th.</p>

APPROVED MINUTES

Terry Thomas – Wants to know if there is any decision being made on the insertion of medians on Valley Center Road in the South Village

Hofler – There will be no possibility of inserting medians for at least 3 years since the road has just been completed. There are no new facts to bring forward that would warrant reconsidering the insertion of medians. What is more important than medians per se is the issue of "traffic calming" The Subcommittee did want the PG to have the South Village section of VC Road designated as a boulevard by DPLU. That will reduce the speed limit to 40-45 mpg and that will allow business owners greater latitude in selecting just how they might calm traffic and attract customers.

Motion:

"On the request of the Mobility Subcommittee, the VCCPG requests that DPLU establish VC Road as a Boulevard from Woods Valley Road to Cole Grade Road."

Maker/Second		Voice Vote (Y-N-A)
Rudolf/Simpson	Motion Carries	10-0-0

Notes:

5.d)

RE04-17, Valley View Casino Employees Parking Lot, 32955 Valley Center Rd. (Robertson for Smith) Request for VCCPG vote supporting a no-parking zone along project frontage on Valley Center Road

Discussion & Comments:

Robertson – The site plan requires a dedicated right of way in favor of the County. With a "no parking zone" on Valley Center Road, the right of way can be 53 feet. Without a "no parking zone", the right of way must be 59 feet. If the PG supports the "no parking zone", the county Traffic Advisory Group will approve the zone administratively.

Hofler – Is there any chance that overflow parking from the Middle School can access the Valley View parking lot?

Russ Hunt, Valley View Casino Development Group – As part of the design, connecting steps will be constructed between the Middle School and the Valley View parking project.

Robertson – As a "no parking zone" would be in the best interests of all parties involved, including the safety of the general public, I propose the following motion:

Motion:

"The Valley Center Community Planning Group supports the Valley View Casino Development Group in its efforts to establish a no parking zone in front of their existing lot at 32955 Valley Center Road."

Maker/Second	Robertson/Anderson	Voice Vote:	(Y - N - A)
		Motion Carries	10 - 0 - 0

Notes:

5.e)

S05-005, TM 5087RPL, SPA 04-004 Orchard Run, APN's 186-240-01, 186-240-02, 186-231-19 and 186-210-44 (Hofler) 5 neighborhood residential development on 118 acres west of Valley Road with portions adjoining Betsworth Rd and Lilac Rd and southern boundary adjoining Mirar de Valle. Site Plan satisfies a condition of the approved project that 3 of 5 neighborhoods (A, B and E) have a site plan prepared to allow the design to be reviewed for conformance with the VC Design Guidelines. Neighborhood A: 120 detached homes on 23 acres. Neighborhood B: 53 attached town homes on 4 acres. Neighborhood E: 5 estate lots on 5 acres. In addition, 52 affordable homes have been dispersed between Neighborhoods A and B; owner John Belanich; TRS consultants.
Vote on support of submitted Site Plan and support of appeal to subsequent DPLU decision if needed.

Discussion & Comment:

APPROVED MINUTES

Hofler – This project has a long & complex history. As part of a state action to encourage development projects, the Tentative Map (TM) has been extended to 2012. It was reviewed by the PG in October 2007 and in revisited by the Design Review Board last month wherein about 6 conditions for improvement in the site design have not been met. Other issues for discussion include the wastewater treatment and sewer plans and a traffic study. There are copies of the site plan if newer members of the PG would like to take about 5 minutes and review them. (break)

Rudolf – Has the applicant satisfied the requirements of the VCMWD regarding wastewater disposal? Is there a contract with the VCMWD?

Belanich – Has determined that he has satisfied the wastewater disposal requirements of the VCMWD but does not have a contract. He will not pursue a signed contract unless he knows that he has a viable project. And he believes the director of DPLU will allow the project to proceed under these conditions.

The County has approved the landscaping plans even though the Design Review Board still does not think they are in compliance with VC standards

Rudolf – We are uncomfortable with a traffic study completed in 1998. A lot has changed particularly in the Villages.

Belanich – The County found the 1998 Traffic Study acceptable and has reviewed it within the last year. The project is divided into 3 units for approval purposes. The first unit was approved in 2006. Unit 2 is now ready for approval.

Sandy Smith – The entire project has 8 to 10 foot high sound barrier walls around it. There are sound walls along Betsworth and Lilac Roads which is not a look that Valley Center wants and the GP Update will not allow sound walls.

Robertson – The community has a problem with the site plan in general. That is such a beautiful piece of property and this site plan is a missed opportunity. The Design Review Board turned it down again on July 21, 2009.

Hofler – There are 3 conditions from the County that are not met by this submission :

- 1.- more current traffic study
- 2.- approval by the Design Review Board
- 3.- contract for wastewater and sewer with the water district.

Motion:

"The VCCPG recommends denial of this project for the following reasons:

- 1) Sewer service availability and commitment has not been satisfied as per the SPA language
- 2) The site plan does not meet Valley Center Design Review guidelines and was rejected again at its recent meeting of July 18, 2009. The criteria are outlined extensively in the DRB comments submitted to the DPLU on February 14, 2006 (see Appendice A) and reiterated July 18, 2007 (see Appendice B)
- 3) the project as a whole does not satisfy current VC Community Plans, nor the guidelines as reflected in the recommendations made in the GP Update
- 4) To require either a new traffic study for the proposed development due to changed conditions from the date of the original traffic study, including but not limited to the presence of casinos, or to require traffic counts and speed surveys at the following locations:
 1. Betsworth within 1000 feet of its intersection with Lilac,
 2. Mirar de Valle at its intersection with Valley Center Road
 3. Old Road at its intersection with Valley Center Road
 - 4.

The purpose of this motion and recommendation is due to the acknowledged problems with the circulation elements specifically set forth via the circulation subcommittee all of which create potential for personal injury liability for the governing public entity. It is imperative that the community of Valley Center stress its disagreement with acceptance of the outdated previously approved circulation element so as to be **on record should liability for this design arise in the future.** "

APPROVED MINUTES

Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)
Hofler/Rudolf	Motion Carries: 10-0-0
Notes:	

Hofler: We have 10 days to appeal any decision made by the Planning Commission

Appendice A

Valley Center Design Review Board

February 14, 2006

MOTION: The Valley Center Design Review Board recommends denial of S05-055 because the Orchard Run development Site Plan, as submitted, fails in the following respects to conform to the Valley Center Design Guidelines as required by the Orchard Run Specific Plan and Tentative Map Resolution.

Orchard Run Specific Plan 95-004 states:

See Section V/A/4 (p. 32 - 34) "A Site Plan Application shall be submitted for development of single family Neighborhoods A and E, Neighborhood B Townhome site and the two Community Recreation Sites. Development Plans for these sites shall be reviewed by the Valley Center Design Review Committee and shall include site, landscape and architectural design as follows:....."

Comment: The Specific Plan text lists which elements of a standard Site Plan Review are "allowed" for each Neighborhood of this project. Architectural Review is limited to the 26 duplex buildings in Neighborhood B. The Valley Center Design Review Board is prevented by the Specific Plan from reviewing architectural treatments for Neighborhoods A, C, D and E which comprise an additional 248 single family homes. There is no record that architectural concepts for nearly 85% of this keystone project have ever been presented to, or reviewed by the community. It is difficult to understand the rationale, or justification, for excluding the local community from providing input on these critical aspects of this cornerstone project.

Without Community Review, the aesthetic and functional future of Valley Center is left increasingly to mega-developers whose objective is not to enhance our community's distinct character - but rather, is to mass produce low-cost homes. According to the company's Value Line investment profile, D.R. Horton, is the largest home builder in the United States and one of the industry's "lower cost operators". The company will build 58,000 homes this year in the U.S.

Obviously, to ensure that 300 homes in the heart of our community reflect our local history and character is much more important to Valley Center than to D.R. Horton. It is the job of Valley Center citizens and County overseers to protect our community from thoughtless, piecemeal, assembly-line residential building -- to

APPROVED MINUTES

ensure that Valley Center grows according to the vision that our Design Guidelines describe. The community's resolve, and the County's support of this resolve, will be challenged increasingly by mass housing producers whose assembly-line design and construction practices cut costs by eliminating the very details that produce distinctive buildings.

Our Design Guidelines can help create a built environment that enhances, rather than obliterates Valley Center's small town flavor and natural beauty -- but only if they are read carefully, appreciated for their overall vision and intent, and enforced.

Materials Reviewed: Design Review of this project is based on plans submitted by the developer to the County DPLU, dated 08-25-05. No model was provided.

They are:

- Sheet 1/9: Overall Site Plan (08-26,05, scale 1"-200");
- Sheet 2/9: Landscape Concept Plan, Neighborhoods A (1"-80')
- Sheet 3/9: Preliminary Site Plan, Neighborhood A (Scale 1"=80')
- Sheet 4/9 : Landscape Concept Plan, Neighborhood B (Scale 1"=40')
- Sheet 5/9: Plan 1-3, California Ranch
- Sheet 6/9: Plan 1-2, Spanish Colonial
- Sheet 7/9: Landscape Concept Plan, Neighborhood E (Scale 1"=40')
- Sheet 8/9: Preliminary Site Plan, Neighborhood E (Scale 1"=60')
- Sheet 9/9: Community Recreation Areas, Landscape Plan, Elevations, Lighting

(Original Scale 1"-30' reduced to ?)

Orchard Run Specific Plan (pp.56-71)

Section VI. Design Guidelines

A. Purpose and Intent

" Valley Center citizens feel strongly about the quality of the community's natural setting and its rural residential character. Implementation of the Valley Center Design Guidelines is intended to protect this special environment while accommodating the growth expected as a result of construction of a sewerage system to serve the community. The purpose of the Orchard Run Design Guidelines is to insure (sic) that this project will have a compatible relationship with the site's natural setting, neighboring properties, and community design goals."

"The following Orchard Run Design Guidelines are organized to demonstrate compliance with specific numbered guidelines found within Part III of the Valley Center Design Guidelines. "

Comment: The Specific Plan text states clearly that the Orchard Run project shall comply with Valley Center's Design Guidelines - not simply with the few excerpts that are reproduced in the Specific Plan Text, but with the full text as it appears in the booklet, *Valley Center Design Guidelines*.

APPROVED MINUTES

Specific numbered guidelines to which the Specific Plan refers are located on the following pages of the Valley Center Design Guidelines:

- # 1: Site Design Process (p. 16)
- #2: Protection of Natural Features (p. 18)
- #3: Save the Oaks and Sycamores (p. 20)
- #4: Design of the Road Edge (p.23)
- #5: Architectural Character (p. 26)
- # 6: Compact Building Groups (p.35)
- # 7: Design for Climate and Energy Conservation (p. 36)
- # 8: Visual Linkages Between Planting, Building and Open Spaces (p.37)
- # 9: Planting Design and Plant Lists (p.38)
- #10: Flood Plain Preservation (p. 42)
- #11: Site Lighting (p. 45)
- #16: Site Planning Principles (p. 58)
- #17: Required Group Open Space (p. 62)
- #18: Private and Group Open Space (p. 62)
- #19: Off-Street Parking (p. 64)

VC Design Guidelines: Citations & Comments

Comments below quote sections from the Valley Center Guidelines only to illustrate particular points that are expressed more fully in the complete text. Again, it is necessary to consult the full text of the manual in order to correctly interpret the intent, meaning and detail of each point.

(p. 16) III/1. Site Design Process

Lines 6-7; *"....Projects must demonstrate sensitivity to the natural setting and must contribute to community design goals."* This refers to Community Design Objectives, which are:

(p. 4) I. Community Design Objectives

Intro Paragraphs 1 & 2: *" The citizens of Valley Center feel strongly about the need for the community to protect its special character and maintain a town identity distinct from others in San Diego County. The community intends to avoid the haphazard urban development common to other growing communities and to preserve the feeling of the Valley's spacious, largely unspoiled environment*

" The purpose of community design objectives and Design Guidelines is to persuade citizens, private developers, and the public sector to work together to make Valley Center a special place whose ambiance, identity and living potential are a model for the County, demonstrating the value of imaginative, concerted community planning and action."

I/ 4: Architectural Character: *"Architectural continuity based on the elements and character of early California buildings...."*

APPROVED MINUTES

Comment: VC Design Guidelines describe and illustrate numerous elements of design necessary to achieve "early California character." The elevations for Neighborhood B -- though labeled "California Ranch" and "Spanish Colonial" as if they were two different architectural styles -- in fact are identical two-story boxes with different roof and shutter materials. This is a good example of the monotonous tract development that obliterates local history and character and imposes a faceless façade, which our Guidelines pointedly reject. Neither "style" incorporates the design substance or quality required to reflect its moniker. D.R. Horton's Project Manager has said that the VC Guidelines require higher-caliber architectural design, detailing and diversity which are "too expensive" for "a production builder". The Design Review Board believes that Horton's low-cost, high-production business model should not be imposed on this keystone project that will characterize the heart of Valley Center - for the sole purpose of protecting the developer's short term profit projections! The long term interests of the community require re-design that respects our Design Guidelines.

The DRB was prevented from reviewing and commenting even on the conceptual architecture planned for the other four neighborhoods. We understand that a few models will be interchanged, and that the architectural style(s) are of the same general stucco/tile hybrid that covers Southern California, which fail to distinguish Valley Center. Our Guidelines call for more variety in architectural forms, materials and details.

(p.16) III/1/A Site Analysis #1-3

Comment: Materials submitted for Design Review did not provide information adequate to assess existing conditions adjacent to the site. Generally, however, this cul-de-sac project is isolated from, rather than connected to adjacent properties, or the existing road network. A significant criticism of this Site Plan is that it fails to capitalize on the property's close proximity to the commercial center planned for the South Node, and is, instead, especially in the case of the highest density north neighborhoods, an automobile-dependent layout.

(p.17) Section III/#1/B Site Design Concept

Paragraph 1: *"The (design) concept derives from interpreting the site's potentials and limitations (through the site analysis), the developer's and owner's needs, and the community design objectives. These interests, sometimes in conflict, must be balanced through a rigorous and thoughtful design process. Following are general criteria to be used in the review of site development proposals"*

General Criteria #1-4

Comments:

#1 Relationship to the Community and Neighboring Properties

The project undermines the community's long term urban design objectives. This is an isolated cul-de-sac neighborhood plunked obviously into the heart of Valley

APPROVED MINUTES

Center's South Village. It is not part of a walkable South Village, which is the community's GP 2020 Plan. Nor will it be hidden from view because the grading plan reportedly destroys 3000 existing mature eucalyptus trees that were planted years ago to buffer the project and were intended to remain. The plan shows a green alley and a chain link fence between what is now the Kony Dairy and will someday be the commercial heart of the South Village. If this alley will eventually be a secondary N-S street, the Site Plan for Neighborhood D should be designed with this in mind.

#2 Relationship to Existing Natural Features

The Grading Plan was not available for Design Review.

#3 Circulation and Parking

This is a segregated community with two formal entrances to each of the north and south neighborhoods which create new intersections in an area that is already congested with traffic. Circulation is internal rather than creating a grid of secondary streets that would help disperse traffic as well as connect these neighborhoods to the commercial core.

Public parking in the North Recreation area appears to reduce the recreation area to less than one acre; parking in the South Recreation Area is inadequate. We believe that these plans have been revised since 8-05, but the DRB has not seen revised plans.

#4 Internal Site Design

Two-story duplexes designed in rows parallel to the street with 5-foot rear and side setbacks create dark, narrow alleys between buildings of unattractive and virtually unusable open space. Building frontages are mainly garage and driveway, defying the Guidelines which call, at least, for 40% living space along the street in the form of front porches, or courtyards. Neither Site nor Landscaping Plans take any apparent advantage of climatic influences, such as seasonal winds, or sun.

(p.18) Section III/#2. Protection of Natural Resources

Intent/Site Analysis

Comment: No site analysis, or rationale for the development pattern or the site design (other than the developer's "high-production, low-cost" business model) was provided.

Guidelines A-H

Comment: Protection, and restoration, of natural resources in Valley Center, of course, is a high priority, particularly in this South Village area where the widening of Valley Center and Woods Valley Roads have destroyed about 1000 mature oak trees during the past three years. This developer proposes to destroy and/or thin 3000 mature eucalyptus trees that were planted grove style years ago around the edge of the property, and were intended to remain as a buffer. Landscaping plans

APPROVED MINUTES

for this project have gone through several editions. The Design Review Board wants to make sure that this project is, at least, as heavily planted as the Guidelines require. We understand that concern voiced by the Valley Center Fire Department's about fire danger has resulted in a 50% reduction of trees planned for this project. We believe this would be a mistake, and ask that the County engage an expert in this area to help balance aesthetic, health, and safety concerns. It doesn't seem that a heavily irrigated Village area, with more than sufficient water, is at risk for wildfires.

The property is located in the South Country Town/Village of Valley Center. Both the existing Community Plan and GP2020 envision this area as a small urban core that will combine village residential density and commercial amenities to serve Village residents as well as the greater community of semi-rural and rural properties. The "hand of man" in this case, in this part of town, should be concerned mainly about implementing the larger vision of a residential and commercial Village area in a way that preserves, and restores, as many natural assets as possible. The project, as proposed, fails to implement the larger vision. This first development to be built within walking distance of this Village commercial area is a cluster of isolated cul-de-sac neighborhoods, utterly foreign to the master plan for the surrounding site.

(p.20) Section III/#3. Save the Oaks and Sycamores

C. Grading Techniques for Preservation of Existing Oaks

Comment: The proponent's plan for preserving the existing oaks should be approved by a certified arborist, and should include: proper grading of the site and not altering water practices, leaf litter, drainage patterns, compaction of the soil around the roots, and any other actions and practices believed to be prudent.

(p.23) Section III/#4. Design of the Road Edge

Intent: *"... As a general design principle, the density of vegetation should increase with the density of development"*

Application: *"... This guideline applies to all properties subject to design review fronting on Valley Center, Cole Grade, Lilac and Woods Valley Roads."*

Guidelines A-H

"... Walls used in landscaping should be of native stone. Unacceptable elements include chain link fence ... walls more than three-feet high of unfinished masonry..."

Comments: Six-foot block walls planned along Mirar de Valle Road and in several other sections of the project, and the chain link fence proposed for the boundary with the dairy, are among the many design themes, elements and materials proposed for this project that accumulate to completely destroy the rural character and charm which the community has long intended for the heart of Valley Center. The effect is overwhelming, irreversible and impossible to soften.

(p.26-34) Section III/#5. Architectural Character

APPROVED MINUTES

Intent: *"... The community desires a style of architecture that will reflect the valley's history, natural landscape and climate..."*

"Architectural character is formed by the basic elements of a building and the manner in which they are combined. There is opportunity for variety within any given character, achieved by the way the basic elements are interpreted and the degree of contemporary or traditional values incorporated"

"The desired character for buildings in Valley Center is derived from early California architecture, a design vocabulary reflected in the state's early missions and adobes ... While "early California" architecture is not considered a specific style, several styles are often considered within it - Mission, Mission Revival, Adobe and Monterey"

"Early California architecture came about as a result of the state's first settlers adapting Spanish and Mexican architectural precedents to the special conditions of California. The process normally meant simplifying the more complex and ornate Spanish examples and their details, adjusting to the more Spartan economy and conditions, different building materials, and primitive workmanship of California."

"As American conquest of California proceeded, the new settlers brought elements of the eastern United States and Classical Revival Architecture, combining them with early adobe and mission examples. The result was what we now call the Monterey Style."

(p. 27) Application: *"This Guideline applies to all development subject to design review..."*

(p. 27) Guidelines 1-6: *"Buildings in Valley Center shall incorporate the following basic elements and characteristics..."*

- 1. Simple, strong one and two story building forms of white and light-colored walls (wood, stucco, textured brick) highlighted and accented with exposed heavy timber beams, columns and details.*
- 2. "Extensive use of courtyards, patios and terraces, often with second story projecting balconies or verandas.*
- 3. "Use of stone walls, fences, and textured ground paving adjacent to buildings, "anchoring" the building to the landscape.*
- 4. "Buildings grouped in clusters to form "outdoor rooms.*
- 5. "Strong shade and shadow patterns created by deeply-recessed windows and doors, generous roof overhangs and careful variation of planes in building elevations.*
- 6. " Along with the basic elements follows a characteristic vocabulary of windows, doors, balconies and other details".*

Comments: Extensive descriptions and illustrations of design details that should be

APPROVED MINUTES

employed to achieve Valley Center's distinctive character are provided in the Design Guidelines (pp.28-34). In addition, the Valley Center Design Review Board has traveled throughout Southern California to shoot photographs of design details for a Valley Center "Stylebook" - which the DRB gave the developer in our January 10th meeting. As of early February, as these comments are being prepared, the developer apparently has yet to share this document - so important to Valley Center -- with the project architect.

Elevations for this project repeat the general theme of the entire proposal. Even though a few minor details are incorporated, the overall architectural design fails to achieve the community's most basic design objectives -- for distinctiveness, quality, variety, and innovation.

To be specific, stucco and tile are acceptable building materials. But, stucco and tile facades on a double row of identical boxes, crammed together artlessly with garage doors and driveways facing the street is a low-cost/high-production "cookie cutter" solution that fails to reflect even the slightest wisp of the "early California" character or distinctiveness that Valley Center's Design Guidelines intend. Our Guidelines call for: porches, loggias, courtyards, arcades, balconies, verandas, recessed windows, shutters, shade and shadow, plan offsets, projections, pilasters, careful variations of planes, and so on -- to list a few of the more obvious and essential elements of the particular architectural styles that characterize Early California.

The developer blames the especially mundane architecture of Neighborhood B on having to offset the costs of 52 "affordable" units. It would seem, however, that due diligence would have revealed to this developer that adherence to the Valley Center Design Guidelines is required by the Specific Plan and the Tentative Map Resolution. Community and County planners never intended to sacrifice the distinctive character of this central Village area in order to entice a developer to build 52 affordable units in a development of 300 homes. We feel that low-cost affordable homes can be built without sacrificing the community's distinctiveness; good design doesn't have to be sacrificed to accomplish affordability. Further, Valley Center's natural beauty, its small town flavor, and its long term commitment to maintaining these increasingly rare assets will help attract between \$450,000 and \$1 Million-plus for 85% of this project (248 homes) that will be sold at above-average (for San Diego County) fair market prices.

Project Manager Richardson and Consultant Stedt have both said that they "want to work with the community." However, they also resist design revisions that would bring the project into accord. They assert that they are "entitled" by previous approvals of the Specific Plan and the Tentative Map to interpret our Guidelines to suit their business objectives without regard for the community's longstanding design objectives. This is a high production out-of-town builder with an aggressive

APPROVED MINUTES

18-month business plan that will impact Valley Center negatively for years to come.

(p.35) Section III/#6 Compact Building Groups

Application: " *This Guideline is a general design principle for all development subject to design review.*"

Guidelines:

"A. Site plans for multiple-building developments should create clear, coherent open spaces between the buildings by arranging them in compact clusters."

"B. Site plans are encouraged to develop spaces between buildings as outdoor rooms ... and an opportunity to accommodate outdoor activities."

Comment: The intent of the Guidelines to create California Rancho or Mission style complexes for multiple building developments - not garage-faced row homes - is clear. References are concrete and specific to central courtyards, entry courts, defined plazas and enclosed gardens that characterize these styles. None of these exist on this Site Plan.

(p.36) Section III/#7 Design for Climate and Energy Conservation

Comment: Again, in this section, the Guidelines refer specifically to protected courtyards, porches, arcades, loggias, verandas, overhangs and other design elements that do not exist in this Site Plan.

(p.37) Section III/#8 Visual Linkages Between Planting, Buildings and Open Spaces

Comment: Again, descriptions of relationships between tree masses and buildings indicates the clear intention of our Guidelines to create classic Southern California buildings not shown in this Site Plan.

(p.38) Section III/#9 Planting Design and Plant Lists

Comment: Comments on the plant palette have been submitted previously.

(p.58) Section III/#16 Site Planning Principles - Residential Development

Intent: "... Residential developments surrounded by walls, parking lots, and rows of garage doors along public streets are examples of practices to be avoided."

Application: " *This Guideline applies to all residential development subject to Design Review.*"

Guidelines A-E

Comments:

A. Integration of Streets and Sidewalks. This Site Plan defies this Guideline which directs new residential developments to align public streets and sidewalks with those of adjacent developments, avoiding the tendency to become enclaves apart from the neighborhood and community. Public streets should be planned to be continuous through adjacent residential developments so as to weave the community together and simplify traffic circulation patterns.

B. Building to Street Relationship. This Site Plan ignores this Guideline.

APPROVED MINUTES

C. Fences and Walls Along Public Streets. Continuous solid fences or walls over 42 inches high should be avoided along public streets; this Site Plan shows 6-foot walls. When walls are used along a street they must be broken at a minimum of 50-foot intervals with 10-foot wide by 2-foot deep recess. Recesses are missing along the Betsworth entrance, and perhaps along other walls, as well. Walls in this Site Plan are also not natural stone, but architectural block.

D. Residential Landscape Requirements. This Guideline requires planting the entire front yard area, and at least 50% of the required side yard areas. At least one tree of minimum 15 gallon size shall be provided for each 400 square foot area. The Landscaping Plan shows no scale, and appears to show one 15-gallon street tree per each duplex; there is no planting between buildings. Rowed-up boxes presented in the Site Plan are perhaps packed too closely together for any significant landscaping to thrive.

E. Special Guidelines for Single Family Detached and Paired Dwellings in Planned Developments. This Guideline intends to *"prevent facilities for the automobile from dominating the street's character."* For paired dwellings: 1. *At least 24 feet of building frontage facing the street shall be devoted to living areas or a front porch.* 2. *No more than 60% of the building frontage facing the street may be devoted to garages, carports or open parking.* Again, the Guidelines are clear.

(p.62-3) Section III/#18 Required Group Open Space

Application: The Guideline applies to all residential development subject to Design Review

Guidelines:

B. Group Open Space: *"The minimum Group Useable Open Space ... shall be 800 SF/dwelling unit."*

Comment: The 52 units in Neighborhood B require 41,600SF, approximately an acre, of useable open space. One version of the Site Plan appears to show a recreation area of about that size; however more than half of this area appears to be a parking lot. Since the flood plain is not useable open space, the recreational area for Neighborhood B appears to be inadequate.

(p.64) Section III/#19 Off-Street Parking

Comment: Detailed plans for parking areas were not provided to the Design Review Board.

Specific Plan 95-004 and Tentative Map Resolution # 5087RPL:

General Comment: There are innumerable discrepancies and contradictions between the Specific Plan text, which calls for adherence to Valley Center's Design Guidelines, and the Tentative Map resolution which relaxes these standards. Many of these have been detailed above.

Specific Plan 95-004

General Comment: The Site Plan simply does not reflect the project described in

APPROVED MINUTES

the Specific Plan text beginning with the Overall Concept and Project Goals and Objectives, and continuing throughout.

A few random examples any one of which would be cause for denial:

(p. 10) The project does not "respect the village character of the community" and does not "enhance ... compatibility with the Valley Center Country Town." It is an isolated, fenced, automobile-dependent cul-de-sac project disconnected from the surrounding area. The project empties additional traffic onto already congested major streets, and fails to provide secondary avenues which would help disperse traffic.

(p. 10) The project does not "conform to the Valley Center Design Guidelines in order to maintain high architectural quality." The developer admits to being a "high-production" builder whose low-cost model forbids compliance with the Design Guidelines.

(p. 13) The Specific Plan requires a barn and a community garden; neither exists on this Site Plan.

Tentative Map Resolution # 5087RPL

(p. 9) Planning and Zoning Administration

12. Specific Conditions

See a. (p. 9) ... "Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the sub-divider shall obtain approval from the Director of Planning and Land Use of a detailed landscaping plan... (plans shall show the proposed solar access/solar panel locations)."

Comment: Not shown.

See a/1 (p. 9) "... In order to screen and limit views into the project site, trees and shrubs shall be planted in the perimeter open space buffers to supplement the Eucalyptus tree stands, which shall remain."

Comment: Grading plan removes these trees.

See a/4 (p. 9) "... A fencing planwith a chain link fence located between the project site and the adjacent boundary with the dairy..."

Comment: No fencing plan was submitted for the overall project; VC Guidelines do not allow chain link, let alone several thousand feet planned for the boundary with the dairy. (No scale was provided on the Cover Sheet, and no other overview of the entire project was provided; the boundary appears to be several thousand feet.)

See a/f (p. 12) "Site Plans shall be submitted for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit and Final Map recordation for each unit for development of single family Neighborhoods A and E, Neighborhood B Town Home site and the two community recreation sites. Development plans for these sites shall be reviewed for conformance with the Valley Center Design Guidelines as set forth in the Orchard Run Specific Plan text dated July 22, 1997."

Comment: Again, none of these lots have been recorded. Re-design in order to be

APPROVED MINUTES

in accord with Valley Center's design objectives is possible, and desirable.

Appendix B:

Valley Center Design Review Board

July 18, 2007

TO: Michelle Bush, Joe Farace, Jeff Murphy, Glenn Russell ~ San Diego County DPLU

CC: John Belanich, Thure Stedt, Sheryll Norris

FM: Valley Center Design Review Board

RE: Comments: Orchard Run: Site and Landscaping Plans

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Orchard Run project proposes a total of 300 dwelling units, of which 172 are to be located north of the Moosa Creek floodplain and 128 are to be located south of the Moosa Creek floodplain. Five separate neighborhoods are proposed; Neighborhoods A and B are proposed north of Moosa Creek while Neighborhoods C, D, and E are proposed to the south of the creek. The creek and the 100-year floodplain are proposed to remain in open space.

The northern development area contains approximately 35.3 acres with access to Lilac and Betsworth Roads. Two neighborhoods are proposed. Neighborhood A consists of 120 single-family detached homes on approximately 23 acres; and Neighborhood B is a 52-unit town home site on approximately 4 acres, reserved for low to moderate income, senior (e.g. 55+) households. Also within the northern area is a 0.7-acre recreation site, 1.5 acres of greenbelt and buffer landscaping, and 0.3 acre for street access.

Required components to the site plan within neighborhood A include a landscape plan, traffic noise mitigation, and building setbacks. Neighborhood B includes a landscape plan, traffic noise mitigation, elevations (architectural character), lighting, and off-street parking. Neighborhood E requires a landscape plan, traffic noise mitigation, building setbacks, and oak mitigation and the community recreation facilities include a landscape plan, elevations (architectural character), as well as lighting. Neighborhoods C and D have no requirements per the specific plan text.

REVIEW PROCESS

The Valley Center Design Review Board met with the applicant for a Preliminary Review on March 13, 2007 and provided preliminary comments to the applicant in response. These comments are attached to this document. The DRB met again with the applicant for an extensive discussion of the project on May 8, 2007 when we agreed to provide written comments in time for the June meeting, which at the applicant's request was postponed until the DRB Meeting on July 10, 2007.

We appreciate the participation of the property owner and his consultants in these meetings, and their willingness to hear the community's concerns. Our discussions have been candid and sometimes difficult. In these moments especially we continue to appreciate the professionalism of the entire Orchard Run team.

REVIEW MATERIALS

This Review is limited to components of the Orchard Run project that are listed below.

<u>COMPONENT</u>	<u>NEIGHBORHOODS</u>					
	A	B	C	D	E	
Full Site Plan Review		X				REC AREAS (North and South)
Landscape Plan	X	X			X	X
Traffic Noise Mitigation	X	X			X	

APPROVED MINUTES

Building Setbacks	X		X
Architectural Elevations		X	X
Lighting		X	X
Off-Street Parking		X	
Oak Mitigation			X

Our review is based on the following two sets of plans.

1. "Site Plan for Orchard Run Specific Plan SPA04-04 & TM5087RPL, Sheets 1-10, date 04-12-07. Sheets include:

- Sheet 1/10: Overall Site Plan (08-26,05, scale not provided);
- Sheet 2/10: Landscape Concept Plan, Neighborhoods A (1"-80')
- Sheet 3/10: Preliminary Site Plan, Neighborhood A (Scale 1"=80')
- Sheet 4/10 : Conceptual Landscape Plan, Neighborhood B (Scale 1"+30')
- Sheet 5/10: Neighborhood B Elevations & Floorplans
- Sheet 6/10: Landscape Concept Plan Neighborhood E
- Sheet 7/10: Preliminary Site Plan , Neighborhood E (Scale 1"-60')
- Sheet 8/10: Community Recreation Areas, Landscape Plan, Elevations, Lighting(Original Scale 1"-30' reduced to ?)
- Sheet 9/10:Preliminary Site Plan, Neighborhood A, Lot Dimensions
- Sheet10/10: Neighborhood A Sound Wall; Neighborhood E Security Wall

2. "Orchard Run, San Diego County Tract No. 5087RPL, Permanent Erosion Control/ Landscape Plans, Planting Plan," Sheets P1 – P13, date 06-06-07. Sheets include:

- Sheet P1- P3: Neighborhood E (Scale 1"-20')
- Sheet P4- P13: Neighborhood A (Scale 1"-20')

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

The DRB is unanimous in its judgment that the Orchard Run project is inconsistent with the most fundamental principles of Valley Center's Design Guidelines.

We have reviewed this project twice in the past two years. The current proposal for Neighborhood B is different from the D.R. Horton Plan of a year ago. However, to our great disappointment, the project overall remains a monotonous, mass produced tract development that squanders its strategic Village location and obliterates rather than capitalizes on Valley Center's unique natural assets. We recommended a year ago in concert with the Valley Center Planning Group that the Site Plan should be denied and the Tentative Map expired. Again, we are in agreement with the Planning Group: the only acceptable course of action for this project is to re-design in accord with the community's vision for the South Node.

It should be emphasized that accordance with Valley Center's Design Guidelines is a condition of final approval for this project. The applicable Guidelines, listed below, are cited specifically in the Orchard Run Specific Plan Amendment (SP95-004) and the Tentative Map Resolution (TM5087RPL).

Community support for this project a decade ago was based on the premise that implementing documents and plans would be in accord with Valley Center's Design Guidelines. Since then we understand that community advisory groups have been prevented from reviewing overall development plans for this project. It would seem in this circumstance that County approving bodies and staff bear the responsibility for ensuring that development plans are in accord with the goals, policies, principles and intentions of the original Specific Plan. It appears, in this case, that the very plans and documents which are supposed to implement the Orchard Run Specific Plan fail to do so and have been "approved" anyway – giving the property owner the idea that he is "entitled" to ignore Valley Center's most basic, foundational design objectives, not to mention the stated intentions of his own Specific Plan! Instances are abundant and leap from the pages of the original Specific Plan! No one should be surprised that the community cannot support the corruption of the vision that was originally approved for this project.

APPROVED MINUTES

How can this happen? What can be done to remedy the situation?

DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

Our comments are organized first by Neighborhood, and second by the plan component. Comments are based upon specific sections and pages of the official booklet, **Valley Center Design Guidelines** -- listed below. These Guidelines appear in abbreviated form in the Orchard Run Specific Plan and are also the Design Guidelines to which the Tentative Map Resolution refers.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

The Orchard Run Specific Plan text (Section IV/A&B/p.56) states that the Orchard Run project shall comply with Valley Center's Design Guidelines.

*"Valley Center citizens feel strongly about the quality of the community's natural setting and its rural residential character. Implementation of the Valley Center Design Guidelines is intended to protect this special environment while accommodating the growth expected as a result of construction of a sewerage system to serve the community. **The purpose of the Orchard Run Design Guidelines is to insure (sic) that this project will have a compatible relationship with the site's natural setting, neighboring properties, and community design goals.**"*

The Specific Plan (Section IV/B, pp.56-71) lists Design Guidelines that apply particularly to this project. Details can be found in the Valley Center Design Guidelines booklet on the pages listed below.

- Site Design Process (p. 16-17)
- Protection of Natural Features (p. 10, 18-19)
- Save the Oaks and Sycamores (p. 20)
- Design of the Road Edge (p. 6, 23-25)
- Architectural Character (p. 11, 26-34)
- Compact Building Groups (p.35)
- Design for Climate and Energy Conservation (p. 36)
- Visual Linkages Between Planting, Building and Open Spaces (p.37)
- Planting Design and Plant Lists (p.38)
- Flood Plain Preservation (p. 42)
- Site Lighting (p. 45)
- Residential Site Planning Principles (p. 58-61)
- Private and Group Open Space (p. 62)
- Off-Street Parking (p. 64)

DESIGN REVIEW: COMMENTS

PLANT SCHEDULE ~ GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Orchard Run project will be "sewered" by a package treatment plant. Landscaping schedules show drought tolerant plants which seems inconsistent with the likelihood that this project will probably be abundantly irrigated with treated water. Our comments below are all directed to a drought tolerant palette. This more global issue needs to be clarified or reconsidered.
2. Replace *Populus fremontii* with a non-invasive variety of tree
3. Replace *Ceanothus Julia Phelps* with a variety that thrives inland. This is a coastal plant that doesn't take heat or heavy soils.
4. Replace *Nerium oleander* due to scorch problems
5. There needs to be more variety of sizes on the *Quercus agrifolia*s and *Quercus englemann*. These are both very slow growing; 15 gallon trees will plant out to less than 5-foot height. Therefore it will take many years for trees to reach their mature height. Add more 24" and 48" boxes, and include 36" boxes. It would also be advisable to add *Quercus suber*. They are faster growing and suited to VC conditions.

APPROVED MINUTES

6. The Nasella puchera tends to re-seed heavily and may become invasive.
7. Trails seem to have the same hatch as lawn?
8. "MA" is a shrub noted on the plans, but not listed on the schedule. What is it?

NEIGHBORHOOD B: SITE DESIGN

1. The Tentative Map Resolution -- Section C. 8. c. (2) (a) dated 6-17-98, p. 8 -- states that 52 Affordable Units must be distributed through Neighborhoods A & B. This Site Plan shows all 52 Units in uniform 4-plexes in Neighborhood B. The applicant insists that he thinks there is a TM Amendment somewhere in one of the extensions that allows the concentration of affordable units in Neighborhood B. We have copies of the Extension docs and can find no reference of an amendment to this effect. It seems to us that the affordable units need to be distributed through the two Neighborhoods A & B.
2. Design Review Board Vice Chair, Robson Splane, has offered to provide more specific architectural design suggestions for Neighborhood B once this issue is resolved.
3. The applicant has not submitted a Site Plan for Neighborhood B that includes content listed in #5906 of the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance. The Design Guidelines also require an analysis of existing Site conditions. Since this analysis is missing, for this review our understanding of existing conditions is based on what we can observe.
4. The Site Plan destroys the property's natural topography, mature trees and rock formations -- defying the community's foundational design objective.
5. The Site Plan needs to comply with Guidelines for Compact Building Groups, design for energy conservation and climate protection and Architectural Character. The current proposal shows uniform and unrelated 4-plex buildings arranged haphazardly on the property.
6. Parking spaces need to be more accessible to more dwellings and to use less land area if possible: maybe break parking areas into narrower strips; maybe arrange parking along narrow "green streets" so it takes less area to park as many cars?
7. Perhaps two or three standard modules could be connected in different ways in order to realize economies of scale, create outdoor rooms that serve as private open space between buildings, and provide a feeling of design diversity within one architectural style.
8. An interconnected building design could resolve several other issues at the same time, including the lack of private open space for some of these apartments.
9. Private open space needs to be 200 SF per dwelling
10. Clustered structures in more compact groups and parking areas that consume less land would help create larger green common areas, as well.
11. How is the useable group open space determined for the separate Neighborhoods in this project? Since the flood plain is not accessible or useable open space, the recreational area for the northern Neighborhoods A & B seems insufficient.
12. There should be a "rhyme and reason" for the layouts between the buildings and parking areas. The Site Plan needs to establish relationships (connections, transitions and so forth) between the different elements of this plan: dwellings to private open space; dwellings to streets and parking lots; group green spaces to private spaces, and so forth.
13. The street design is not shown. Are there pedestrian walkways along the streets that encircle and traverse this project? How wide are the streets? Do they follow standards for rural roads?
14. A significant criticism of the Site Design for Neighborhood B, and the Site Design of the entire project, is that it fails overall to consider its context and its relationship to adjacent properties.
15. Most significantly the Site Design fails to capitalize on the property's close proximity to the South Node commercial center. Its' automobile dependent layout undermines community goals for neighborhoods adjacent to the Country Town.
16. This is a walled enclave that turns its back to surrounding commercial and residential properties.
17. Senior affordable housing is next to childrens' playing fields, and is separated from commercial services and public transportation routes.
18. Highest density neighborhoods A&B are farthest from the commercial core when they should be

APPROVED MINUTES

closest.

19. Densest residential development should be located in areas that are adjacent to the commercial Town Center and be feathered out to the Village boundaries on the West and North.
20. Estate lots (1.5 acres) are adjacent to the commercial Town Center.
21. Re-designing this project in accord with GP2020 would resolve myriad land use, circulation and open space issues.
22. Residential densities would be increased adjacent to the South Node Town Center, and feathered, but at GP2020 Village densities, to the north and west.
23. Light recreational uses of the Moosa Creek flood plain adjacent to the Town Center would likely be allowed by updated environmental studies. It would seem that environmental studies which require this open space to be totally inaccessible (fenced with chain link, we understand) likely pre-dates the construction of a golf course on the Moosa flood plain at Woods Valley Ranch. A Village Green, or a passive park with restored vegetation and trails connecting the two built areas, for example, would seem more appropriate for an area where residential and commercial development is so intense.

NEIGHBORHOOD B: LANDSCAPE PLAN (Scale 1"-30')

DESIGN

1. Again, the community's foundational design objectives are to preserve the natural features of the land and to avoid level grading of entire lots.
2. It appears that the plan calls for grading that destroys natural rolling topography, rock formations and mature oaks. These are the natural assets that characterize Valley Center and that the Design Guidelines (AND the Community Plan) were written to preserve.
3. This plan does not show topography or indicate where slopes are created by cutting and filling. However, it appears from the 20-Scale Landscape Plan for Neighborhood A that pads on the west side of Neighborhood B are at a higher elevation than pads on the east side. The applicant needs to present a landscaping plan that shows slopes in order for us to understand how the elements of this landscape will work together.
4. The Guidelines state explicitly that removal of oaks or sycamores is to be avoided, and that there shall be a diligent effort to retain and protect (during and after construction) mature native trees. No effort is visible on these plans.
5. The landscaping plan ignores Guidelines for climate protection and energy conservation. The Site Plan ignores this Guideline, as well.
6. Plans need to show design, materials, finishes and colors for all elements of the landscape design: pathways, fences, seating/benches, outdoor structures and so forth.
7. Screen and shade the parking lots with vine covered arbors or pergolas. Valley Center has very hot summers, without more trees or redesigning, the existing design on the parking lot will only be an eyesore & create more heat for the automobiles parked in those lots.
8. Add street trees.

PLANT PALETTE

1. Plant selection in Neighborhood B needs to flow with the rest of the project. The plant material specified is a completely different palette than any of the other neighborhoods. A project of this size should coordinate landscape design and plant selection in different sections of the development so that the overall effect is cohesive.
2. The palette is much too limited. Our comments in March included adding more diverse plant material in all categories, trees, shrubs, and ground covers, and the addition of vines of which there are none. We would like to see greater diversity in sizes, ages and species of trees and shrubs, as well as a diversity of cycles -- so that year-round interest is achieved.
3. Again, more variety is necessary for foundation shrubbery. Only 2 ornamentals shown and both are overplanted in our county. I was hoping for a more creative shrub palette for the building foundations. The other choices are natives and not good choices for buildings. These plants are

APPROVED MINUTES

also specified on the berm at Citruswood Run. There are so many more species of plants that do well.

4. The plan shows uniformly small and slow-growing trees, sparsely planted, so that a sense of "landscape" and screening will take too long. Size and age diversity will help.
5. The parking lots need additional evergreen trees and large shrubs for year-round screening, and more shade trees for our hot summer climates. These comments were mentioned previously also, with no additional trees added.
6. Replace *Eucalyptus torquata*. It has no resistance to the new pests that have devastated our area.
7. Replace *Platanus occidentalis* with *Platanus acerifolia* 'Bloodgood'. *Platanus occidentalis* is a native to the east coast, so not only will it not grow very well, they are not readily available except in the mid-west or the east where they are grown. Although specifications state it can survive in all growing zones, there are western Sycamores that would thrive instead of struggle.
8. Replace *Arctostaphylos* 'Emerald Carpet' with an *Arctostaphylos* that thrives in our area. There are several. Emerald Carpet is a native to the Northern coast, and requires acidic soil to survive. Our soil is very alkaline with poor drainage.
9. Coastal native plants will not grow in our area. Replace them with proper choices for our climate and soil.
10. Previous comments recommended pergolas or arches to the parking areas for vines. Those have not been added.

NEIGHBORHOOD B: ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS

1. New compact building design discussed above should meet architectural objectives for distinctiveness, quality, variety, and innovation within a particular architectural style.
2. The Guidelines call for: porches, loggias, trellises, courtyards, arcades, balconies, verandas, recessed windows, shutters, shade and shadow, plan offsets, projections, pilasters, careful variations of planes, and so on.
3. Elevations should show varied forms: roof-lines, surface materials, porches, doors, windows, trim, and other architectural details.
4. Again, perhaps two or three standard modules could be connected in different ways in order to realize economies of scale, create outdoor rooms that serve as private open space between buildings, and provide a feeling of design diversity within one architectural style.
5. Although Craftsman is an acceptable architectural style for Neighborhood B, California Rancho or Mission styles would more readily accommodate these ideas, especially when they are combined with arranging multiple-building developments in compact groups.
6. SPA requires that affordable housing meet the community's guidelines for high quality design, architecture and materials.
7. Detailed elevations should be provided for all structures that are planned; diversity of the buildings needs to be shown.
8. Show building materials, style and color selections and decorative details for dwellings.

NEIGHBORHOOD A: LANDSCAPE PLAN

DESIGN:

1. The Conceptual Landscape Plan @ 1:80 scale varies from the Planting Plan at 1:20 scale. Comments pertain to planting patterns and plant materials shown on the 1:20-scale plan.
2. Landscaping Plans for Neighborhoods A (and E) show mass-production building patterns that are completely at odds with principles described in Valley Center's Design Guidelines. The Guidelines pointedly discourage "monotonous standard suburban tract development" and high

APPROVED MINUTES

- density residential housing in a sprawl design (See illustration on p. 10.)
3. There is no attempt to set aside particularly attractive areas as open space. Rather, "open spaces" for this Neighborhood are either areas where building is forbidden by statute and access is limited (such as the flood plain), or they are odd-shaped crevices that are leftover after grading imposes a standard "cookie cutter" development pattern on the property.
 4. Extreme grading also removes the natural soil; new landscaping is then planted in inferior sub-soils that do not produce healthy landscapes. *This is just one of the abundant contradictions to the Conservation Goals that are stated in the Orchard Run Specific Plan (p. 29).*
 5. Again, this plan defies the community's foundational design objective which is to retain the natural landscape by following natural topography. This plan shows cuts, fills, man-made berms and walls that obliterate the gentle roll of the landscape and create an artificial, monotonous arrangement of building pads, stepped like parking places in a city parking garage with a "trail" squeezed into areas between the tiers.
 6. Landscaping Plans for Neighborhoods A, (and Neighborhoods B and E, as well) propose the removal of most mature trees in order to impose a cookie-cutter plan on the landscape. Both practices are inconsistent with the Design Guidelines.
 7. The 80-scale landscaping plan faintly shows "Existing Live Oaks To Remain." However, the 20- scale plan shows no oaks. Why? No effort is visible in the 20-scale landscaping Plan to retain any mature native trees, let alone the "diligent effort" the Guidelines require. The Guidelines state explicitly that removal of oaks or sycamores is to be avoided.
 8. The proponent needs to protect oaks that will remain and ensure success of the new trees. An urban forester should be retained to ensure best practices, to include: proper grading, watering, leaf litter retention, drainage patterns, compaction of the soil around the roots, and any other practices believed to be prudent for the long-term preservation of these trees.
 9. Mature eucalyptus trees that currently surround the property are not shown; the SPA calls for these to remain. Will they remain? How will they be protected during the grading of this Site?
 10. All trees and shrubs should be planted in natural clusters, not in straight rows as they are along Lilac Road as well as along streets that are internal to the project. Again, the site design leaves insufficient area for landscaping that is in accord with the community's Guidelines.
 11. The Guidelines state that new residential developments should align public streets and sidewalks with those of adjacent developments, avoiding the tendency to become enclaves apart from the neighborhood and community. Public streets should be planned to be continuous through adjacent residential developments so as to weave the community together and simplify traffic circulation patterns.
 12. Continuous solid fences or walls over 42 inches high should be avoided along public streets; this Site Plan shows 6-foot walls, and in some place 4-foot berms topped by 6-foot walls.
 13. Walls should be low and built of native stone, or of block faced with natural stone.
 14. Fences along trails should be lodge pole fences, made of wood – not "trail wood PVC".
 15. Show samples of style, finish and color for any metal fencing.
 16. The Guidelines require that the entire front yard area, and at least 50% of the required side yard areas be planted. At least one tree of minimum 15 gallon size shall be provided for each 400 square foot area. Homes are packed too closely together in a typically suburban configuration (5-foot setbacks!) for any significant landscaping to thrive.
 17. Plant more trees – at least one for every 400SF – along streets, in front and side yards, between back yards, along both sides of trails.
 18. There is so little outdoor space between the uniform rows of buildings in Neighborhood A – the setbacks are 5-feet – that "visual linkages" between elements of the landscape design cannot be satisfied. There are crevices between dwellings, but no "landscape" per se remains.
 19. Perhaps some of the requirements for side yard planting, made insufficient by narrow setbacks, can be transferred to creating landscaped buffers between back yards of so many homes in Neighborhood A.
 20. Varied topography would also help buffer one yard from another.
 21. Show street design and street-edge treatments. Are there pedestrian walkways along these

APPROVED MINUTES

streets?

22. Trail design should be more natural, less linear and geometric.

PLANT PALETTE

1. Vary varieties of front yard trees, shrubs and ground cover
2. Vary plants along Lilac Road. They will all be in their "down" cycle at the same time. Add plants with different cycles so that year-round interest is achieved.
3. Replace Platanus in lawns with suitable tree for lawns.
4. Vary sizes of Quercus (see general comment).

NEIGHBORHOOD E: LANDSCAPE PLAN

DESIGN:

1. The Oak Mitigation Plan does not show on the Scale-20 plan.
2. The Scale 20 Planting Plan (Sheets P1,P2,P3) shows significantly fewer trees than the Scale-80 Concept Landscape Plan. Why?
3. Plan shows too few trees, and no shrubs or groundcover. Guidelines call for landscaping – shrubs, trees and so forth – in front yards, and 50% of side yards.
4. There are too few yard trees, and too few street trees in Neighborhood E AND in the inadequately narrow buffer along Mirar de Valle Road.
 - a. The Guidelines call for one tree every 400SF in the landscaped edge zone -- a MINIMUM size of 15 gallons. The DRB would like to see a diversity of sizes, ages and species.
 - b. Landscape buffers along major roads in Valley Center should be a minimum of 20-feet deep. Mirar de Valle is Circulation Element road.
5. Is the very significant reduction of trees a result of a recommendation by the Fire Marshall? If so, we need immediately to address how fire safety and prevention can be accomplished in Village areas of town – while at the same time honoring the community's desire for abundant landscaping in Village areas.
 - a. Water is overly abundant in the South Village area as a result of water disposal required by the wastewater treatment package plant.
 - b. This project will be lavishly irrigated.
 - c. Wild fire risk in "urban" Villages would seem minimal.
 - d. Development and road widening projects have already eliminated several thousand trees in the South Node!
 - e. Landscaping is especially critical to the function and appearance of dense residential and commercial Village areas.
 - f. Cities throughout the Mediterranean climates of the world manage to enjoy street trees and abundant landscaping without exploding into flame. How do they do it?

PLANT PALETTE

1. Vary ground covers and plant in sweeps; only one type is shown
2. Vary species of trees
3. Buffer zone plant schedule needs to be reviewed

RECREATION AREAS: LANDSCAPE PLAN

DESIGN:

1. It would help to see landscape plans for these areas in 20-Scale and in the contexts of adjacent properties. Some adjacent uses require dense buffering. Others require something else.
2. The shape of the "Northern Park" on Sheet 8 appears not to fit into the shape allotted on Sheet 1. Is the Northern Recreational Area next to the treated water storage area for the Package Plant?
3. What are the useable open space area requirements for this project overall, and do these

APPROVED MINUTES

recreational areas meet these requirements?

4. Recreation areas appear to us to be too few and too small for the number of homes they are supposed to serve.
5. 25%-30% of these recreation areas appear to be consumed by the parking lots.
6. Recreational areas and their parking lots are too skimpily planted. The Guidelines are specific about the planting of off-street parking areas.
7. Show metal fence style, finish and color.
8. Show benches, picnic tables, trash receptacles,

PLANT PALETTE

1. The 'Patio Tree' selections are actually shrubs that are being manipulated in nurseries to be small trees. Typically, these seem to have more maintenance and general problems associated with them. Since the placement of these are in the parking areas, it would be advisable to replace these with actual small trees that will deal with the surrounding concrete, radiant heat and reduced growing area.
2. Additional ground covers are needed for the shrub areas.
3. Replace Eucalyptus sideroxylon with a different species, maybe Tipuana Tipu or another large canopy tree. With all the ongoing pests that are attacking our existing Eucalyptus and new psyllids arriving, at this point the planting of Eucalyptus needs to be limited. The existing Eucs in our area have been devastated and continue to struggle to merely survive.

RECREATION AREAS: ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS

1. Architectural forms for the barn and meeting hall are appealing; we'd like to see windows, door and decorative detail on the meeting hall.
2. Show materials, finishes, colors of all structures.

Comments below were provided to the applicant after the Preliminary Review in March:

Valley Center Design Review Board

Mar. 24, 2007

TO: John Belanich, via Thure Stedt and Sheryll Norris, TRS
FM: Valley Center Design Review Board

RE: Suggestions for Site Plan and Architecture, Orchard Run, Neighborhood B

Dear John,

Below, please find an outline of suggestions for the design of the "Affordable Housing" section of your Orchard Run project. Please understand a few things about what we're trying to do... First of all, our neighbors, here in Valley Center, are relying on us to uphold the elements of the community's Design Guidelines so that we can maintain our own "personality" (in the hopes that we will not simply blend-in with

APPROVED MINUTES

the large and faceless, suburban tracts which surround us.) These Guidelines are not vague. And, we believe good architectural design can often be realized for the same price as mundane designs. The second fact that is important to keep in mind is that (as much as the "designer within us" would be pleased to offer specific design sketches etc...) our guidance and reference is limited to Valley Center's Design Guidelines and the collection of photographs that we call our Visual Guide.

A copy of our Design Guidelines is available at the DPLU. If your architect feels that photographs of the points we make below would be helpful, we can send a copy of our Visual Guide, as well. We have found that most architects who are talented enough to make a living in this competitive field are capable of "hitting home runs" on your behalf, provided they are given clear goals and parameters, as well as the latitude to perform creatively for you!

Site Plan & Orientation-

The current plan is much improved over the last, in that we are not looking at a straight, and repetitive, row of garage doors, dominating the fronts of almost identical stucco boxes. (The Guidelines rule out "repetitive design" in favor of diversity.) It is still repetitive and linear, however, which makes it feel more like an institution than a village neighborhood in a country town. Suggestions include:

- slant the orientation of the dwellings, so they do not line up perpendicular to the roads; arrange them so that they create more intimate areas -- "outdoor rooms" -- between the buildings.
- Vary the elevations and contours of the topography.
- Further break-up the visual impact of the parking lots, so as to minimize an "asphalt desert" appearance. Consider meandering / serpentine parking "strips" with diagonal parking (rather than parking lots). Add more trees and bushes -- to shade/cool and to shield from view -- these parking areas as well.

Architectural Design & Details-

- Styles to consider include: Spanish Mission, Mission Revival, Adobe, Monterey, Craftsman, Victorian, Neo-Classical, California Ranch (Monterey's are often rectilinear, as your plans are, but their verandas take the curse off of that design... they often make beautiful homes).
- See especially VC Design Guidelines pp. 26-39.
- Avoid straight, unbroken facades. Use offsets, recesses, overhangs, and projections to give buildings substance and depth
- Add porches to break-up the rectilinear plans. These can also provide cover for the entries, and add outdoor living areas as well as. By customizing, and varying, the designs and layout of the porches for each building, these can actually help you avoid the "cookie cutter" look (problematic in a commonly shared floor plan) and make each building appear to be more distinct!

APPROVED MINUTES

- Minimum Private Useable Open Space is 200SF
- A variety of porch posts, lintel and rails designs can further differentiate the buildings.
- You can also customize the lines of the roofs, between the different buildings, to differentiate.
- Add dormers windows, bay windows or clear story windows, to some of the buildings?
- Vary window and door designs and treatments.
- Border doors and windows with a variety of heavy frames, painted tiles, storm shutters, stone, brick, moldings or eyebrows and awnings.
- Vary wrought iron rails, gates, balconies, window grates, lighting, planters and details.
- Various balustrades and "false" verandas.
- Add a variety of stone (or stucco) planters, walls and water features to customize the residences.

Materials & Finishes-

- Siding to consider might include stucco (with stone sections and details). Modern adobe, slumpstone or red brick. Non-wood clabboards, T&G or board & bat.
- Roofing materials, as well as roofing designs, can also provide an opportunity to either tie the structures together, or differentiate them. Most common in today's pallet (following the fires a few years ago) are the ceramic tiles which come in a wide variety of colors and finishes from Spanish red tiles to dark gray "faux slate" tiles and even "faux shake tiles. There are also a variety of steel roofing materials.
- Color and finishes can be employed to dramatically add to the "curb appeal" of your structures. Your architect can help here, provided you give him the latitude to provide some "color studies" which go beyond the "brown on beige" pallet that is monotonously employed to housing tracts. Don't be afraid to use contrast, and even small details of color!

Landscaping, Hard-scaping, Plant Palette

It's good to see that you added some walk ways!

- Curve the walkways. Vary hardscape materials.
- Vary the landscape design; create pleasant outdoor spaces and views; add pergolas, fountains, planted areas; provide spaces and site furnishings tailored to the special needs of senior residents, such as benches for sitting and visiting... this is designed for seniors, isn't it?
- A lushly landscaped environment can give the illusion of privacy, intimacy, serenity and a much higher perceived value.
- The design of the landscaping around the units and the parking areas does not seem to flow. There needs to be more landscaping, and to provide more of a garden environment to the units.
- Overall, the project needs more varieties of trees, and a greater number of trees. The parking

APPROVED MINUTES

	<p>areas require more trees and screening to be provided by plant material. It would improve the parking area to have some sort of arbor or pergola for vine planting to break up the sea of asphalt. We are in a very hot summer climate, and without more trees or redesigning, the existing design on the parking lot will only be an eyesore & create more heat for the automobiles parked in those lots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entry view coming in off Citrus Wood Run is horrible. There is nothing inviting to bring you into the project. The first view is flat asphalt parking lots with a minimum of trees. This is not the type of view we want for the community. We want to see more vegetation, especially with the addition of all the asphalt and buildings that would replace a natural area. • We appreciate the effort in creating a plant palette that is based upon our guidelines, and with addition of some varied material, we think the landscape would be a wonderful addition to Valley Center. Our area is unique in the plant material we are able to grow. This should be reflected in the plants chosen. The addition of some drought tolerant, Mediterranean plants to combine with the natives would make a much more interesting, and four-season landscape. • There is a lack of texture and 'all season' interest. With the addition of appropriate plant material, this could be created. There should be vines planted on all fences & sound walls to break up the vertical hardscape. I look forward to seeing a more interesting and appropriate planting palette at our next meeting. <p>Other Suggestions-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will be happy to send you our Visual Guide. • Last thing to keep in mind is that your rentals can appear to be both distinct and individual "homes", while still maintaining a visual relationship to each other! Your architect can help, and I'd be please to speak with him should he wish to call. <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Robson Splane, Vice Chairman, Susan Moore, and other members of the Valley Center Design Review Board</p>
5. f)	<p>AD09-029, 4043 Calle De Vista. Wilson request for variance to build second dwelling on the property. Owner: Vera Wilson Revocable Trust. (Weaver)</p> <p>Discussion & Comments:</p> <p>Weaver – The owner is applying to upgrade an existing building to code and use it as a dwelling. The current building is about 700 sf and she wishes to expand it to about 1000sf. She may have an easement problem with the neighbor because the building lies very close to the property line.</p> <p>Rudolf – If the neighbors are not in approval that may be a big issue. Have you talked to them?</p> <p>Weaver – There are a number of unresolved issues which need to be pursued further.</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>"Recommend that consideration of the Wilson project be continued to a future meeting when more information is available"</p>

APPROVED MINUTES

	<table><tr><td>Maker/Second:</td><td>Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)</td></tr><tr><td>Rudolf/Weaver</td><td>Motion Carries: 10-0-0</td></tr><tr><td>Notes:</td><td></td></tr></table>	Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)	Rudolf/Weaver	Motion Carries: 10-0-0	Notes:	
Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)						
Rudolf/Weaver	Motion Carries: 10-0-0						
Notes:							
	<p>Chairman Hofler – We will need a time extension to complete items on the Agenda. Suggest extension of 5 minutes.</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>"That the adjournment of the VCCPG regular meeting of August 10 be extended to 10:05 pm"</p> <table><tr><td>Maker/Second:</td><td>Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)</td></tr><tr><td>Hofler/Montross</td><td>Motion Carries: 10-0-0</td></tr><tr><td>Notes:</td><td></td></tr></table>	Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)	Hofler/Montross	Motion Carries: 10-0-0	Notes:	
Maker/Second:	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)						
Hofler/Montross	Motion Carries: 10-0-0						
Notes:							
5.g)	<p>S09-010, ER 09080071 –APN 186-280-03 Villalobos STP, 8400 square foot building proposed to be constructed for feed and agricultural supply sales on 2.55 acre site located along Valley Center Road between Terry's Hay & Grain and Napa Auto Parts. Property is split zoning c36/RR.5/RR.1 currently being used as a storage area of Terry's Hay & Grain. (Van Koughnett)</p> <p>Neither PG member Van Koughnett nor project proponent is present. The item is tabled until September meeting.</p>						
5.h)	<p>P-03-08e; ER 03-08-034 Valley Center Community Church, 29019 Cole Grade Rd. Notice of adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration; the project is a major use permit for a new religious assembly complex to be built with 6 structures totaling 65,000 sq.ft first phase of the project, including septic system pump house and utility garage, totals 25, 313 sq. ft. (Dave Montross substituting for Terry Van Koughnett)</p> <p>Mike Adams, (Valley Center Community Church) The project is in its 7th year and has been approved by the VCCPG at every stage. We are asking VCCPG to continue its support as Church responds CEQA requirements and the Notice of Mitigated Negative Declaration.</p> <p>Sandy Smith (VCC Subcommittee) – Has Minority Report to submit, requesting that the PG make an addition to the motion being brought forth by the VCC Subcommittee. The project borders on the northeast boundary of the North Village and even though it may be a while before the village is filled in and a network of roads is vital, this is the time to reserve the right of way on the VCC's southern border. Does not want to raise the cost to the Church but would like the VCCPG to ask for an easement on the south border of the project. If we do not ask for such a huge project now it will not connect with a workable road network.</p> <p>Mike Adams - The Church has been very cooperative with such requests in the past and has already committed to an easement on the west side and a trails easement on the east side as well. It is not willing to part with control and use of more land.</p> <p>Motion:</p> <p>"The VCCPG recommends approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration with the condition that the dedicated easement trail along Cole Grade Road be updated to match the current Trails Plan for "Type D Special Pathway" designation"</p> <table><tr><td>Maker/Second</td><td>Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)</td></tr><tr><td>Montross/Rudolf</td><td>Motion Carries: 10-0-0</td></tr><tr><td>Notes:</td><td></td></tr></table>	Maker/Second	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)	Montross/Rudolf	Motion Carries: 10-0-0	Notes:	
Maker/Second	Voice Vote: (Y-N-A-)						
Montross/Rudolf	Motion Carries: 10-0-0						
Notes:							

APPROVED MINUTES

6. Subcommittee Updates Informational Reports by Subcommittee Representative):

- a. Circulation – (Debra Hofler, Chair).
- b. GP Update -- (Richard Rudolf, Chair).
- c. Nominations – (Susan Simpson, Chair)
- d. Northern Village – (Keith Robertson, Chair)
- e. Orchard Run – (Debra Hofler, Chair).
- f. Parks & Rec. – (David Montross, Chair)
- g. Rancho Lilac – (Ann Quinley, Chair)
- h. Southern Village - (Terry Van Koughnett, Chair)
- i. Segal Ranch (formerly Spanish Trails)—(Oliver Smith, Chair)
- j. Strategic Planning—(Terry Van Koughnett, Chair)
- k. Tribal Liaison – (Terry Van Koughnett, Chair)
- l. Valley Center Church – (Terry Van Koughnett, Chair)
- m. Website – (Terry Van Koughnett, Chair)
- n. Pauma Ranch (Ann Quinley and Keith Robertson, Co-Chairs)
- o. Castle Creek (Oliver Smith, Chair)

7. Correspondence Received:

- a. DPLU to VCCPG; POD 08-018; 2009 Zoning Ordinance Amendments (revises various regulations including definitions, Animal Regulations, Use Regulations, Setback Regulations, Temporary Use Regulations and various procedures.
- b. DPLU to VCCPG- Draft General Plan Appendices for the Mobility Element
- c. Department of Parks and Recreation to VCCPG- Request for the input of the VCCPG in developing a five-year park project priority list for the expenditure of Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) funds in the community.
- d. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG- Preliminary and Final Agendas for the July 19, 2009 meeting of the San Diego County Planning Commission at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego.
- e. DPLU to VCCPG; GPA 09-004. General Plan Amendment to the public facility element to clarify politics related to project review. Amendments to implementation measures within the Public Facility Element of the County general plan. Changes reflect long-standing implementation practices related to fire and sheriff review of development projects.
- f. Accretive Group to Oliver Smith, invitation to open house on July 14th, 6:30 to 8 PM at Castle Creek County Club; 8794 Circle R Drive, Escondido, CA to discuss thoughts on the future of Valley Center.
- g. Kevin Jeffries to Oliver Smith and the VCCPG request to VCCPG to endorse ACA 8 which would amend the California constitution to require the State legislature to be covered by some provisions of the Brown Act.
- h. San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee to VCCPG, Agenda for the July 31, 2009 meeting of the Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) at 9:00 AM at 9621 Ridgehaven Court in San Diego.
- i. DPLU to VCCPG; 3000(AD) 09-029; Wilson second dwelling unit Administrative permit; Project address; 14043 Calle De Vista, Valley Center; APN 189-220-22; KIVA project: 09-0112432; information for further processing application.
- j. Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to VCCPG; Agenda for the San Diego County Board of Supervisors for July 21 and 22 at 9:00 AM; Room 310, 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 02101
- k. DPLU to VCCPG; POD 08-012, Log No. 08-00-004; SCH No 2008101047 Tiered Winery Zoning Ordinance Amendment; July 16, 2009, Amends the SD County Zoning Ordinance to introduce a new winery classification and revise the regulations for two existing winery classifications. Comments open until August 31, 2009 at 4:00.
- l. DPLU to VCCPG; POD Water Conservation Landscape Design Manual; Responses requested by August 17, 2009.
- m. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG; Notice of a regular meeting and a preliminary agenda for July 31, 2009 at 9:00 at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego
- n. DPLU to VCCPG, TPM21074 Beebe 4 lot Subdivision Replacement map, Project Address 30931 Little Quail Run, APN133-302-29, project continuing from May, 2007.
- o. Peter Price to DPLU Planner Marcus Lubich, notice of withdrawal of ZAP07-006 (email date July 2, 2009)
- p. DPLU Director to VCCPG, 2009 Zoning Ordinance Amendment POD08-018 Corrections to draft Ordinance and Summary distributed for public review (see Correspondence Item a.), dated July 24, 2009.
- q. DPLU Planner Amber Griffith to VCCPG Chair (email dated July 31, 2009), P06-061 Replacement Map for MUP, Tapestry Meadows Equestrian Center, Project Address 30673 Andreen Rd (near west Lilac Rd and Circle R Rd), APN 129-111-32, requested response date Aug 17, 2009, received application update only, no map.
- r. Gary Wynn, Wynn Engineering to VCCPG Chair (email on 7/30/2009), request to refer southern village traffic calming to VCCPG Southern Village Subcommittee.
- s. Robert and Lola Weiser to VCCPG Chair, letter dated July 25, 2009 noting objection to proposed Edco project.
- t. DPLU to VCCPG, POD08-002, County Draft Density Bonus Ordinance dated July 30, 2009, comment period Sept 14, 2009.
- u. DPLU to VCCPG, TPM20811RPL Preliminary Notice of Approval dated July 31, 2009, ; owners Bassam and Ahlam Mustafa. Site address is 9770 Circle R Drive, Valley Center, creation of 4 two acre or greater lots; lot split or minor subdivision plus designated remainder parcel.
- v. Clerk of the Board of Supervisors to VCCPG; Agenda for the San Diego County Board of Supervisors for August 4 and 5 at 9:00 AM; Room 310, 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 02101
- w. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG; Notice of a regular meeting and a preliminary agenda for August 14, at

APPROVED MINUTES

9:00 at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego.

8.	Requests for Items on Upcoming Agendas:	
a)	None	
9.	Adjournment (as agreed by prior motion)	10:05 p.m.
Notes:		

Respectfully Submitted,
September 7, 2009
Christine Lewis, Secretary

Revised Submission – Sept. 11, 2009

Final Revision/Approval – Sept. 14, 2009